

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/500,317

Applicant(s)

KAWASAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit

1792

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon.

(3) _____

(2) Jonathan P. Osha.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 01 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: US 6764658 B2.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Osha convinced the Examiner that the prior cited art to Deng et al was no longer obvious under the Examiner's stated grounds. The Examiner agreed, however, the Examiner applies Applicant's prior IDS reference deem to at least obviate the claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Rudy Zervigon/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792